UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,126	01/23/2004	J. Scott Perry	P-0418	6089
	7590 12/31/200 & AUFRICHTIG, P.C		EXAMINER	
300 EAST 42N 5th Floor			FERTIG, BRIAN E	
NEW YORK, N	NY 10017		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,126	PERRY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN FERTIG	3694	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH oute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matte		is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	rawn from consideration. I/or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to be ne drawing(s) be held in abeyanc ection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/764,126 Page 2

Art Unit: 3694

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim1 is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim recites a number of statements of intended use (i.e. 'for' clauses). Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (see MPEP § 2106 for further discussion). Examiner respectfully suggests the elimination of the 'for' recitation so as to positively recite the limitations. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1

This claim recites "means for" plus function language. This language invokes the rebuttable presumption that applicant seeks treatment under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Such treatment requires that applicant clearly identify particular structures or steps within the disclosure as the means for or steps for that applicant intends to claim (see MPEP § 2181). No such clear identification has been found, rendering the claim indefinite. For the purposes of examination below, it is assumed that applicant did not intend to invoke treatment under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Applicant is advised

to explicitly rebut the presumption that 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph treatment has been invoked, amend the claims to remove the invoking language, or point out language in the disclosure that clearly identifies the particular structures or steps applicant intends to claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to claim 1

This system claim recites, as an element of the system, 'a plurality of counterparties'. Such a recitation, when given its broadest reasonable meaning, reads on human beings (see MPEP § 2105 for further discussion). Examiner, respectfully suggests elimination of the recitations directed to the counter parties as system components, and reliance, instead, on a positive recitation related to the system counterparty that defines the nature of the transaction being claimed.

With respect to claims 4-6

These claims are rejected for incorporating the subject matter rejected above.

With respect to claims 2 and 3

These claims are directed to a process (method). The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *In re Bilski*, Appeal No. 2007-1130, has affirmed that a statutory process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform

underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (i.e. the machine-or-transformation test). To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example, by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example, by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Applicant is also directed to MPEP § 2173.05p, providing guidance with respect to reciting a product and process in the same claim and MPEP § 2111.02 [R3] providing guidance with respect to the effect of limitations within the preamble of a claim.

A thorough reading of Applicant's Specification does not yield any explicit teaching of a 'machine' as contemplated by the machine-or-transformation test, however, Examiner would consider evidence from Applicant's disclosure that implied such a machine and respectfully requests Applicant provide an argument citing such evidence from the record.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the Objections and rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101, set forth in this Office action.

Inquiry

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN FERTIG whose telephone number is (571)270-5131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm

Application/Control Number: 10/764,126 Page 5

Art Unit: 3694

EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B.F./

/Mary Cheung/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694